

Christian Education

Vol. XXV

DECEMBER, 1941

No. 2

GOULD WICKEY, *Editor*

Published in February, April, June, October, and December

N. Queen St. and McGovern Ave., Lancaster, Pa.

*By The Council of Church Boards of Education in the
United States of America*

744 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D. C.

October, 1941 to June, 1942

Entered as second-class matter March 29, 1926, at the Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 18, 1918. The subscription price is \$1.50 per annum. Single copies, regular issue, 30 cents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Annual Meetings in Time of War, <i>An Editorial</i>	67
The Place of Philosophy in the Church-Related College, <i>Charles F. Sanders</i>	69
What Students Think,	
I. Education for Peace, <i>Jane Nelson</i>	77
II. Misled Students Seek Sterner Virtues, <i>Douglas R. Robbins</i>	78
A Christian Philosophy of Education, <i>L. Vernon Caine</i>	80
Some Reflections on Campus Religion, <i>George L. Abernathy</i>	84
Difficulties in Realizing the Ideal of Christian Education, <i>Charles A. Anderson</i>	95
The Christian College Facing a Chaotic World, <i>J. Leonard Sherman</i>	99
The Standard for Educational Values, <i>G. B. Sweazy</i>	103

IMPORTANT NOTICE: CHANGE OF MEETINGS

The annual meetings scheduled for Cleveland have been cancelled on account of the special meeting called by the National Committee on Education and Defense in Baltimore on January 3 and 4. Reservations may be made at the Hotel Lord Baltimore, and the Southern Hotel, Baltimore, Md., the former being the headquarters. Read the editorial for statement of the schedule of meetings of the National Conference of Church-Related Colleges and the Council of Church Boards of Education on January 4, 5, 6 and 7, 1942.

Christian Education

Vol. XXV

DECEMBER, 1941

No. 2

Annual Educational Meetings in Time of War

AN EDITORIAL

AS this editorial is being written, the United States has declared war, the radios have gone on a twenty-four hour schedule, and the newspapers are releasing extras. Immediately questions are raised whether programs for national meetings should be carried out and whether all plans for national meetings should be cancelled. Naturally this magazine cannot speak for general educational groups, but we do have definite convictions with regard to the significance and function of Christian educational groups.

The treacherous assault on the United States when she was striving to maintain peace in the Pacific will effect a united nation for the defense of national honor, justice and righteousness. The Churches recognize that there are legitimate demands which our government may make upon us and of our duty to respond. At the same time they recognize and admit that there are duties to God which are superior to duties to man. Where there are conflicts, each individual must make the decision as to his ultimate loyalty.

The Churches of the United States are cooperating with the government for true national defense and are calling upon their people for the sacrifice of both time and money and even self for the preservation of the highest ideals of the American way of life—justice, righteousness, equality of opportunity, freedom, and peace. They are preaching the conquering power of love and the necessity of desiring power not over others but for others.

Here's the heart of the reason why religious educational groups should carry out plans for their meetings, regional and national. This judgment was expressed to me this morning by a layman working in a government educational office. In such days as these Christian educators have much to contribute to the morale and perspective of people who may very easily lose their sense of value and direction.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

It costs to maintain religious educational organizations, but the cost is worth the results. Christian education does make a difference in the lives of individuals as well as in the life and atmosphere of communities and society. Americans are willing to pay the price according to the product in the material realm. If Christian education decreases crime, enhances the business, social and moral relations, and develops a refined culture which influences generations down through the years, then Americans will endeavor to make more permanent and effective those organizations and institutions, directly or indirectly related to the churches, which are molding a leadership for all walks of life who, in turn, will build a social order on Christian principles and with Christian virtues.

The emergency has compelled the National Committee on Education and Defense to call the educators of America to a special meeting at Baltimore on January 3 and 4 to be held in the Hotel Lord Baltimore, Md. After careful consideration the Association of American Colleges decided to cancel the Cleveland meetings. Likewise agreed the Council of Church Boards of Education and the National Conference of Church-Related Colleges. Programs will be greatly changed but the following represents the sketch of the meetings of national organizations:

Meetings at Lord Baltimore Hotel, Baltimore, Md.

January 2—

Association of American Colleges

American Association of Junior Colleges

January 3 and 4—

National Committee on Education and Defense

January 4, 8:00 P.M. Public Mass Meeting

National Conference of Church-Related Colleges

Council of Church Boards of Education

January 5—

A.M. National Conference of Church-Related Colleges

P.M. Council of Church Boards of Education

Evening. General Secretaries of church boards of education

January 6—

Denominational educational conferences

National Commission on University Work

January 7—

Denominational educational conferences

The Place of Philosophy in a Church-Related College

By CHARLES F. SANDERS*

"PHILOSOPHIA BIOU KUBERNATES: The Love of Wisdom, the Guide of Life." In selecting this motto the Founders of Phi Beta Kappa were setting forth a fundamental fact about human life. But, more than this, they were promulgating a challenge. And the challenge contains the implicit recognition of the further fact that human life reveals a basic impulse towards something *which is not yet*; and the further implication that the *way* to this creative goal is through WISDOM. Man, as he finds himself by analysis, is endowed with a disposition towards Destiny. As Emerson expressed it: "Man is unfinished, and he knows it."

WISDOM AND KNOWLEDGE

Now let us note well that wisdom is something vastly richer than knowledge. It is the goal towards which the philosophers of all ages have been groping. An Old Testament writer issued the same challenge: "With all thy getting, get wisdom." The antithesis to knowledge is ignorance, but the opposite of the wise man is a fool. And being a fool is much more costly than being ignorant. Equipping a fool with knowledge is about the most dangerous thing that can happen.

Teaching mere knowledge is comparatively easy. It can readily be motivated by sheer curiosity, and the prospect of a job may stimulate it. But transforming the fool involves the whole man; not only his intellect, but the harmonization of all his powers. This requires an awakening. Most people think pretty well of themselves, and the deeper their folly so much more profound is their egotism. "None are so blind as they who will not see."

"Tselu was stopping one night at the Stone Gate and the Gatekeeper asked him, 'where are you from?' 'I'm from Confucius,' replied Tselu. 'Oh is he the fellow who knows that a thing can't

* Since 1906 Dr. Sanders has been professor of philosophy at Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa., and is now honored with being the Emeritus Professor of Philosophy. Out of thirty-five years of fruitful teaching he writes this article.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

be done and still wants to do it'? Weisheng Mou said to Confucius, 'Why are you so self-important and constantly rushing about? Don't you talk a little bit too much?' Confucius replied, 'It isn't that I want to talk. It's because I hate the present moral chaos.' "

So it was with the greatest of the Greek Sages, Socrates. A student in a course in elementary Greek History was asked who Socrates was and made reply: "He was an old man who went about ancient Athens giving people advice, and they poisoned him."

From these examples I am aiming to show the extent and the superficiality of the world against which the philosopher is impelled to set himself. But the student was wrong in his description of Socrates. Advice is just what Socrates never gave. He never felt wise enough for that. The one thing he did was everlastingly to expose the absurdities and the follies of men in the hope that they would revise from within. The philosopher knows that that is the only way a fool can be cured.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

At this point philosophy makes contact with religion. In the presence of the utter folly of human sinfulness Christianity insists there must be a new (spiritual) birth. But the pride of man is such that he tends to resent being told that he needs help, so he turns humanist and seeks to build a beautiful theory of the universe and of man without recourse to the transcendent Deity. And he puts on a good show that way. If he has been much saturated with laboratory science he is likely to turn naturalist and seek to derive everything from lower orders; making man a little higher than beasts, instead of a "little lower than God."

No one likes to be dubbed ignorant, at least within the range of the things by virtue of his business or profession he should know. But he dislikes it even more to be called a fool. I should like to urge the reader to lay this paper down at this point and reflect for awhile. Why is it that it hurts so much to be called a fool? Most pains result from some disorder. But the moment we speak of *disorder* we have implied a claim to know something about *order*. I wonder whether the pain experienced in folly (don't forget that we frequently call ourselves fools) isn't evidence of

PHILOSOPHY IN A CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGE

something deep within our natures which clamors for something we at the moment are keenly aware we do not have—something we quite desperately would like to have. Well, at least it is at that point that philosophizing begins. It is the profound sense of our own unfinished state that impels us to the effort to find out about it.

The question raised in the preceding paragraph looms large, if we give it a chance. It is that natural expansiveness of this question that produces two striking results, which are in opposition to each other. To the philosopher it is this very expansiveness, together with its fundamental importance, that furnishes his challenge to his everlasting search. The goal of philosophy is *to see man and his universe whole*. In every other field exhaustive research and accurate treatment of the facts is taken for granted. The philosopher accepts this principle, and by so doing knows that he has enlisted in a task that is unending, but the more fascinating on that account. However, he cannot organize a stock company to support him in the exploitation of his field. It is hard to attach any dollar mark to his results, and it is even more difficult to get a dollar-minded world to see that the philosopher's products are too fine for a dollar-rating. The opposite effect of this expansive question is to turn away from it as if by denying the problem we could dispose of it. And of all follies, this is the greatest. Novalis observed, "Philosophy bakes no bread, fills no purse, builds no houses; but it gives us Freedom, Immortality, and God."

Professor Boodin has observed that "God is incomprehensible, but without Him everything is incomprehensible." Seeing things whole demands that man's sense of the beautiful, the true, and the good, be accounted for with the same diligent search as the various factors operating mechanically in space. The astronomer makes the most cautious calculations of the personal equation in order to bring his results to the highest degree of accuracy of which he is capable. But when a great Teacher says, "The pure in heart shall see God"; or "The meek shall inherit the earth"; reckoning with the personal equation can be very embarrassing.

PHILOSOPHY AND TOTALITARIANISM

Perhaps the most ominous exposure of the past quarter of a

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

century is the fact that totalitarianism has not been evaluated in the popular mind according to its essential meaning. The truth is that totalitarianism in its essence, is godless. But the popular mind has been fed propaganda, labelled truth, which has branded one type of totalitarianism, allowing the implication that the others are all right. It is the old propagandist trick, "If you let this man go, you are not Caesar's friend." But the "common people heard him (this man) gladly." From the philosopher's point of view this utterly fallacious method not only clouds the issue, but definitely prevents the truth being found. The philosopher must see things whole. At the end of the second century it was the mind that was schooled in the philosophic spirit of Greece that constituted the foundation of the Christian Church. When the great Roman totalitarian later subsidized the Church, with the consent of the Bishops, the coming of the Dark Ages was assured.

It is not at all mysterious that our totalitarians have repudiated the Deity and silenced the Churches. They have done that in every age. They must do it, otherwise their acclaimed supremacy is left an open question, which they cannot stand. These "Leaders"—God save the mark, there are no leaders until there are followers—build their respective regimes on the skeptical base "that science has not found God, so, to say the least, it is highly doubtful whether there is any. Until further notice I will be the ultimate court of appeal."

PHILOSOPHY AND SCIENCE

Next to the calamitous warfare, the achievement of Science is the most striking of man's accomplishments during the past century. There is no discount on that. But I am deeply wondering whether we are fully aware of its cost. I am not referring to the low level of endowments, which are an item, but to the superior level of our *devotions and our hopes*. At the end of World War I, Doctor Ayres published a very tantalizing book entitled "Science, The False Messiah." We were so superficial as to believe that Science, which is limited to the physical order by its method, could *save us* in the personal order (the order of free spirit). The disillusionment of war, and war that becomes increasingly worse, came as a terrific exposure. The thinker seek-

PHILOSOPHY IN A CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGE

ing to *see things whole* was fully aware that such arrogant dismissal of the spiritual could not but be most devastating. The devastation is here. I can't take space to elaborate. "Be not deceived, God is not mocked, whatsoever a man (nation, or age) soweth, that shall it also reap." In the presence of such ultimate calamities Science has nothing to offer.

The thing I wish to make emphatic is, that Science has done a splendid job. There are scientists who have made unwarranted claims, but even these would have been harmless, had the protagonists of spiritual realities, of the fundamentals of sound spiritual ethics, anchored in the essentials of religion, fulfilled their task. By way of illustration, why did the Protestant Churches split between North and South during the Civil War? Was it not because Churchmen and their following think in terms of *interests*? Just now we are being told that the Axis is afraid to bomb Cairo lest it turn the Mohammedan world against them; and the Allies are afraid to bomb Rome lest the Catholics throughout the world give them trouble. I am only trying to point out the extent to which the blight of partisanship prevents mankind from "seeing things whole." The Middle Ages could not be fair to Science, because it was under the discipline of a dictatorial church. At the present time we have lost perspective because we are dominated either by *Interests*, *Race*, *Nationalism*, or *Scientism*. In so far as these function, "seeing things whole" gets little chance. It is almost pathetic how Mr. Thyssen complains (after having sunk his fortune in putting Hitler in power) "that Hitler is utterly lacking in understanding economics." There isn't a scintilla of complaint against Hitler's morals. If Hitler had backed Thyssen's *economics*, he would doubtless have rated all right with Thyssen.

THE CASE FOR PHILOSOPHY

If what has been said in the preceding paragraphs has been understood we should be prepared to state the case for Philosophy. Its business requires it to rise above every type of hampering prejudices, and to take the most honest reckoning of every factor that enters into the human enterprise. The reason I did not list Religion among the influences hostile to perspective is, first, because genuine religion is not hostile; and second, because

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

institutionalized religion, as we find it in the various Churches, so largely follows instead of leads in the social pattern of thought. Christ offers what He has to "all the world" on the same terms. The children of Abraham demanded favors which Christ refused, so they demanded His crucifixion. Pilate (poor Pilate) was in Jerusalem to maintain Roman peace, and, personally, he wanted to hold his job. So, when he found that his job was involved he recanted his judicial judgment.

But Pilate was a sophist. The sophist is basically skeptical. His method is trained to the business of making his own cause appear the better part, even though he knows it is not. By contrast Socrates held against all sophists and all sophistry that *Truth is one, and that it can be found*. I have often wished that Socrates might have had conversation with Jesus. Of all men, Socrates knew how to ask penetrating questions, and Jesus is unsurpassed in answering questions that are deftly put. So it turns out that Socrates' whole concern was to find the truth; and Jesus answered this question by saying, "I am the Truth." With all of Socrates' humble uncertainty he was motivated by a profound conviction that there is such a thing as truth, and that it could be found. He did not believe it was easy. On the contrary, he knew it was difficult, but with all of its difficulty he accepted death rather than quit his search for Truth.

Philosophy, then, "is the effort to break through to the meaning of existence" (Berdyaev, *Destiny of Man*, p. 15). And the philosopher believes there is a meaning to life, and that its meaning can be found. I am well aware that there are skeptics listed among philosophers, but in so far as they make their skeptical attitude final they have dogmatically forfeited their claim to the philosophic spirit.

As touching the problems of religion, or even religion itself, philosophy aims "to break through to its meaning." It is not an accident that the development of religion has constantly enlisted philosophers in its cause. Neither is it an accident that religion, or at least institutionalized religion, has invariably declined during the periods in which it neglected or repudiated the philosophic spirit. Religion, at its best, is prophetic. It is engaged in building a Kingdom such as has never been. The essence, therefore, of its message is of things that are to be.

PHILOSOPHY IN A CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGE

Moreover, religion is a living thing and by that token more than philosophy. But the moment I try to tell you what my religion is, or Mohammed tries to tell me what his religion is, both he and I must "break through to the meaning" if we would understand each other. If we do not succeed in getting "the meaning" across, we simply fail to understand each other. If we refuse to try we simply stagnate within our little pool and the great stream of the Spirit rushes by. The history of the world is full of these eddies, produced by indolence, egotism, stupidity, or some other form of refusal to accept the difficult fact that religion cannot be passed on from one to another in a sealed package. No less than science, every age and every individual must think through to the meaning anew. This is the service that philosophy renders religion. Religious institutions have a fatal tendency towards authoritarian stagnation and spiritual death. Witness Israel after King David, and Christianity after Constantine, and Protestantism in the contrast between 1520 and 1580. Religion needs the constant prodding of the philosophic spirit which has the peculiar knack of "breaking up our caked prejudices."

Here I must record my profession of faith. As a lifelong student of philosophy I am definitely convinced that the ultimate "meaning of existence" is found in religion. And I am just as profoundly convinced that every age is obliged to reinterpret vital religion to its own people in the language which they can understand. Philosophy of religion is aggressive; apologetics (which always seems to me to smack of an acknowledgment of uncertainty which sells out at least half of its cause at the start) is defensive. Jesus never, so far as I can find, asked his disciples to make a defense for him; but He did emphatically tell them to be "witnesses," to let the world, to its uttermost parts, see the "Truth." Life just does mean something more and even different under the light of religion. When religion is ignored, or opposed, or encased in bigotry, life loses its wholeness and culture drifts toward destruction.

Here, then, is the place of Philosophy in the church-related college. The Church rightfully professes to act as *pilot* across the turbulent sea of life. The complexity of an advanced civilization may require certain educational institutions to devote themselves entirely to the "technics" of physical livelihood.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

The purport of that proposition lies outside the plan of my theme. But to the degree that the church-related college allows the terrific vocational trend in modern education to dominate its program, so far it has denied its professed responsibility, in favor of taking its place alongside of the technical schools. A school is not made by the title it writes across its public announcements, nor by the propaganda speeches made by its officers. Colleges are made by what they *do to the students*, not by what *they do for them*. If it makes them skilled technicians, and nothing more, it will eventually leave them baser men than if colleges had never been. If the church-related college neglects the place of philosophy in its work, it not only promotes an unbalanced education, but it stands before the world self-condemned as a false prophet. "Where there is no vision the people perish." As a minimum of philosophic discipline, the church-related college owes it to her Age that Logic, Ethics, Introduction to Philosophy, and Metaphysics be required subjects.

"Ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth shall make you free," is fundamental in Jesus' teaching, and here Jesus and the philosophers get together. It is just because Truth as the guide of life must be whole truth, it can't be a department of truth, that specific discipline in "seeing things whole" is so important. It is at this point that world culture has fallen down. Study the curricula of our colleges, especially of our church-related colleges, and see how gradually the philosophic disciplines have been shoved out to make room for "practical courses." The result has followed quite logically. We have many truths that we did not have a century ago, but we have less unity. That is at once the present strength and the ultimate weakness of totalitarianism. By its nationalistic propaganda it has instilled into its youth the sense of community that rallies them to their "cause." And by the same process, in the long range, it must end in defeat for the simple reason that world community cannot be built on the hostility of nationalities. Peace can come only by justice, and justice knows neither national, racial, nor class boundaries. The philosophic disciplines train men to see truth and justice in their aspect of universality. If the church-related college refuses her responsibility it may well come to pass that she will be eliminated. Survival is achieved by the exercise of normal functions.

What Students Think

I. Education for Peace*

By JANE NELSON, '42
St. Olaf's College

WHILE somewhere in Europe men are killing each other, and somewhere in America men are getting ready to kill, it is a comforting thought to know that somewhere on a hill men come home to a college which believes that you can educate men in the ways of God without benefit of bayonet.

America has always believed that by education you could raise the great mass of people to the level of the intellectual aristocracy, but the fathers of our republic were determined that state and church should be forever separate, and as a result of their fears and precautions, the unwritten law of the land has always forbidden the teaching of religion in public schools. But the spirit and intent of the law has been violated in a manner never intended by the fathers. Men seek to know the truth without benefit of God; and, educated men, they fall far short of being wise men. It is a strange system of education that will accept the wisdom of Plato because it is called philosophy and reject the wisdom of Jesus because it is called religion. But it is done, and great educators and thinkers in America today are choosing to teach and live by a philosophy rather than a religion.

In a world which is echoing and re-echoing the call to arms, we need education. But education alone will fall short of the goal for which we strive. Only recently a professor in one of our largest mid-western universities maintained that any attempted peace with the German people must be based on vindictive humiliation and a philosophy of extermination. A man who will guide the thinking of hundreds of American youths, publically advocated that the German people be so crushed that they could never rise again. And he proved it—in a strictly academic manner. The little gentleman with the Charlie Chaplin mustache must have smiled to himself at an educated people who choose to pre-

* This item appeared as an editorial in *The Manitou Messenger*.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

serve their ideals with the weapons he has invented to destroy their ideals.

America needs colleges dedicated to God without apologies to man. For education without God is seeking to know the truth by discarding the one absolute truth. Educated men sat at Versailles, and they failed. Brilliant men returned to their home to build a new world, and it fell. Great educators taught a new generation, and they erred.

That is why it is important that somewhere today men come home to a college on a hill which believes that you can educate men in the ways of God without benefit of bayonet.

II. Misled Students Seek Sterner Virtues*

BY DOUGLAS ROBERT ROBBINS, '42

College of William and Mary

THE students of this generation have been subjected to a bombardment of bitter cynicism. In recent years, many men of penetrating intelligence have been busy blowing to bits, almost every combination of words which express high human aspirations. We have lived in an age when brilliant novelists have made cynicism their profession. We have lived in an age when many of the nation's teachers joined in this cult of cynicism; in brief, we have grown up in an age in which men have thought it clever to be cynical.

In face of this, it is no wonder that we have drifted unconsciously into the fallacious position of viewing the activities of the human race through the glasses of complete cynicism. This distortion of the past does not improve our ability to understand the present.

The time will come when the state of apparent madness of a part of the human race will no longer be fashionable. Meanwhile, those of us who recognize the worth of the intellectual and spiritual fruits of our western world must become convinced of the part education is bound to play in a world returned to its senses.

* This is part of the address delivered at the Sixth Annual Honors Convocation, October 15, 1941.

WHAT STUDENTS THINK

In older times this thought was in the minds of everyone who had the privilege of attending college—those were the days in which men were measured by their personal qualities and two older qualities not often heard of today—the quality of righteousness and the quality of faith.

In the Chapel of this college there is a plaque dedicated to the memory of that great Law Chancellor, George Wythe—

“Erected as a tribute to his courage, ability, uprightness and purity.” What an inspiration it is to study under men of that character. In large measure the greatest products of our colleges are due as much to such qualities in their teachers as to the scholarly attainments of these men.

In times past I am sure the great and mighty fields of purely formalized knowledge were subordinate—the controlling conceptions had to do with values—values which they believed to be universal and which by faith they considered eternal. Is not the perpetuation of these great values the real work of a college in a Democracy?

The Democratic ideal by its very nature appeals to the finest and best in youth—who want to think seriously and act nobly. We as young people are ready and eager to share in Democracy when we catch the vision. Maybe we students want to know just what Democracy really is. For several generations youth has not been stabilized in a democratic way of life. We encountered the post-war dilemma and all the economic, moral and religious changes that came with it. Young people faced the depression, unemployment and all its shortcomings. Now it is being asked to fight for a Democracy in which it has not found stability in the past.

We as students of the College of William and Mary must learn to hold fast to a firm and definite faith—that there is a difference between right and wrong which cannot be destroyed by a negative philosophy. We must make distinction between truth and lie, between courage and cowardice, between moral initiative and cynical irresponsibility. Such a belief is essential to the fulfillment of the ideals of a college whether in time of emergency or in days of peace to which we look forward.

I urge you, my fellow students of William and Mary, to use your college education in seeking and maintaining worthy ideals.

A Christian Philosophy of Education

By L. VERNON CAINE*

ONE of the most important tasks of the superintendent in the public school is the selection and direction of the teachers who will instruct and guide the children of his community. At least in the middle west, one of the major jobs of the Christian college seems to be the training of teachers for work in the public schools. These teachers occupy a most influential position in molding and guiding the lives of the young people. It follows therefore that the question should arise as to the relative success of the Christian college and the secular institution of learning in training teachers for this task.

The thoughtful layman will expect that, on the whole, the boys and girls who choose the church school will be better material for teaching than those who go elsewhere. Since they are often the children of the minister, the Christian layman, and the more careful parents, who have by birth and breeding given them a superior start in life, it is not unlikely that they are better raw material for teachers as they enter the church school than those who go elsewhere. What do the colleges make of these people?

As a superintendent, it has been my observation that the Christian college turns out a more conscientious product—a teacher of better character and a more devoted servant to the best things in life, but as to educational philosophy and psychology that goes with it, I am unable to detect any difference between the work of the two types of teacher training institutions.

Now facts are facts no matter where one learns them but there is a considerable difference between the influence of a pagan and a Christian biology teacher even using the same facts. To a lesser but still marked degree the same holds true for an English or mathematics teacher. The philosophy back of the treatment

* Mr. Caine is superintendent of the De Smet Public Schools, South Dakota. Believing thoroughly in the work of the church-related college, he is somewhat disappointed in a phase of its work and writes accordingly.

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

of subject matter and the pupil, the thing the state requires in those semester hours of professional study preliminary to issuance of a certificate, is vital to the attitude and influence of the teacher.

Educational methods and their motivating psychology are notoriously unstable. Were it not so we would not have the fads that from time to time propose to revolutionize teaching. We would not skip from project method to contract plan, from discipline to "self expression" and the student determination of the content of curriculum. We would not indulge briefly in the dozens of transient schemes of agile brains whose "latest" method consists of a kernel of truth in a bushel of nonsense. We would not be trapped by the idea that the newest is best if we had a rock of truth underlying our educational psychology. With the hectic and unstable philosophy we now hold we scramble from ice cake to ice cake rather than getting to shore.

We should face the fact that much of the basic material upon which we build our educational philosophy is non-Christian. Jean Jacques Rousseau, one of the pioneers in educational philosophy and an anti-Christian, is still a great influence in this field. His well expressed idea that people are by nature good and, given the proper surroundings, will instinctively choose the good rather than the bad is still much alive in educational circles. The Progressive Education Movement which of late has had such a foothold in some of our leading teacher training institutions is largely a reincarnation of this same idea. The supposition that the lower grade school child can pretty well do as he pleases and can indulge in as much "self expression" as the furniture and surroundings will stand is rooted in the idea of the essential goodness of natural man.

The same misconception permeates much of our social and political thinking. We are led to believe that the abolition of sin (if there is any) and crime is altogether a matter of the alleviation of poverty. To reach a pretty satisfactory state of happiness and peace man needs only to be assured a good house, sufficient clothing and necessary food. It is the logical conclusion reached from the educational premise upon which much pedagogy is built.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

We like to study rats, monkeys and other animals in educational psychology and it is well that we should for by so doing we learn much of the working of the human animal. But to ignore the fact that man is more than an animal is a real tragedy. Because the rat and the ape are apparently motivated completely by the environmental reactions to their heredity does not prove that man has no power to react otherwise than the natural way to his surroundings. The animal cannot alter his life and there is no power from above to help him do other than respond to the stimuli he receives, but to draw the conclusion literally or by implication that the same is true of man is to completely depart from Christian truth.

Our whole philosophy and literature of education is shot through with these ideas. The texts we use in all kinds of teacher training departments are, in this respect, the same. No matter to what school of educational thought we may give allegiance most of the teaching is along the line of a Godless universe full of man-animals who do the best they can under the conditions in which they find themselves with little responsibility upon themselves for what they do.

We need in education a firm foundation, a little more of the bed rock of truth. Why not develop it in the Christian college? Where can one find the Christian philosophy of education taught? Who ever heard of a text or a chapter of a text based upon the psychology and method of the Master Teacher when he was instructing here on earth? Why teach the idea of Rousseau that man is by nature good when the common sense of those who raise children and the teachings of the Bible prove to us that man is by nature sinful? Why teach in one department of the college the fact of the redemption when in the education department we assume the original perfection of humans? Why teach that man is helplessly imprisoned by his surroundings when the Scriptures and the history of Christianity are full of examples of God's power to lift men above their surroundings and make them what they may become? How long are we going to be satisfied to teach a pagan philosophy in Christian colleges?

Much of this is done in innocence. We should first of all go over the education departments to see what are the facts about

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

our basic philosophy and what our texts teach about man and how he learns. We need a Christian viewpoint, a Christian textbook and a Christian teacher. We should not stand in awe of the large state schools with fine equipment and famous faculty members. We should not be willing to copy them, we should do better than they. We should seek first the kingdom of God and His truth. What will be added will be beyond our expectations. Why not a Christian philosophy for the teacher training department of the Christian college?



Some Reflections on Campus Religion*

BY GEORGE L. ABERNATHY

PROFESSOR H. N. Fairchild, a distinguished teacher of English at Columbia University for more than a score of years, has described one phase of religion in higher education in these words: "The religious illiteracy of American college students is amazing. They are ignorant of the Bible. Apparently they have never even heard of the basic doctrines of Christianity. They are completely unaware of the fact that the Christian Church has a philosophy, a history, a sociology, a psychology, and a literature, all of which have been profoundly influential in the shaping of modern civilization.

"This applies in surprisingly large measure to students who come from what are euphemistically called 'good Christian homes.' They seldom have been shown that Christianity has anything to do with the life of the mind, for their formal religious training has generally been obtained from intellectual noncombatants. In their minds it exists on about the same plane as boy scouting. Hence the more they use their brains in college, the more their religion is pushed into the background. Most students who say that they have 'lost their religion' in college had no religion worth mentioning when they entered. Such faith as they possessed has not been smashed; it has simply atrophied through being cut off from the intellectual life of the college. People are constantly saying this situation is bad for religion, and it certainly is."

These charges of Professor Fairchild are all too true as many other college teachers can testify from their own experiences.

* This article is the result of observations and reflections as an undergraduate at Bucknell University, a graduate student at Oberlin, the Universities of Michigan and Wisconsin, and a teacher at Culver-Stockton College (Canton, Mo.) and the University of South Dakota, where Dr. Abernathy is now professor of Philosophy and Psychology. Interest in student activities is maintained by serving as a member of the executive committee of the Wesley Foundation.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON CAMPUS RELIGION

Both the quantity and the quality of religious instruction which students have had before entering institutions of higher learning are indications of the extent to which our age has been secularized. On several campuses where informal surveys were made of these matters it was found that approximately one-third of the students had either never had any direct contact with a church or, if they had, they failed to maintain the relationship beyond the eighth grade of school. Another third had severed their ties with the life of the church either during high school days or during the transition from high school to college. Thus, only a third of the students in these institutions had maintained their relationships, however fragmentary and superficial, with organized religion during the entire period of adolescence. If these facts and Professor Fairchild's charges are applicable to the situations which exist on the majority of our university and college campuses, we ought to resist more stubbornly the complacent optimism which is sometimes implicit in the reports of itinerant observers who announce how much easier it now is to get a larger hearing for religion than it was on the college campus of 1929. Whether one ought to be pessimistic or optimistic about the possibilities and the immediate prospects of organized Christianity and Judaism among college students is dependent, in part, upon how one conceives the relation of religion to higher education. It may be, therefore, of some value to attempt to describe how this relationship actually works out on many campuses.

PROBLEMS OF THE COLLEGES

At the turn of the century the relation of religion to higher education in this country was understood and accepted. The great majority of our institutions of higher education were then not only proud of their religious parentage but continued to acknowledge and to seek the support of religious bodies. Religion was regarded as the keystone of the educational arch, for it was a determining factor in educational theory and policy. This is hardly the situation today except in institutions controlled by the Catholic Church and a few of the more conservative Protestant denominations. We have witnessed in the last four decades what is ordinarily referred to as the rapid secularization

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

of American college education. It was, first of all, a period of rapid expansion. In this expansion large new schools, state and municipal, were developed largely with public funds. Carrying no specific religious acknowledgment, they probably now care for a majority of the nation's collegiate youth. The older established privately endowed universities have succeeded in getting rid of every vestige of ecclesiastical control or denominational affiliation. Their deference to religion, if any, is in many cases a respectful tribute to the past rather than any acknowledgment of present obligations or concerns. The "Christian colleges," now usually referred to as denominational or liberal-arts colleges, have increasingly discovered their religious obligations and pretensions difficult and embarrassing—especially during the depression years when some of them preferred to present themselves primarily as municipal or regional institutions. Thus, in many of these institutions religion no longer occupies the central place in either their corporate life or their curricula. The president of a denominational college in the struggle for more endowment, in the recruiting of students, in the effort to secure a winning football team, and in the building of a persuasive public relations policy finds that religion is only one factor, and perhaps a very minor one, among many which have to be integrated into a successful administrative policy. Thus, as in the outside world, religion becomes more frequently only a fractional interest among many others competing for the time, interest and support of people.

CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS

The term "Student Christian Movement" is sometimes loosely applied to the older institutional expressions of voluntary student religious work, as for example, in the YMCA, YWCA and Student Volunteer Movement. These organizations arose directly out of the religious and missionary awakenings that stirred America so deeply in the middle of the last century. The leadership of these organizations was moulded by forces which have no counterpart in the experiences of the present student generation. The appeals by which Mott, Speer and Wilder brought countless college students to the offices of the mission boards at the turn of the century and the appeals by which Grenfell brought college

[86]

SOME REFLECTIONS ON CAMPUS RELIGION

men and money to Labrador are likewise unknown to the overwhelming majority of students today. The contemporary student is separated from all this experience by, not only the tremendous changes in the structure of world society during the past quarter century, but by the huge intellectual and social smorgäsbord which our American institutions of higher education have assembled during the last two decades. Thus, the presuppositions and campus environment with which the Student Christian Movement worked have changed profoundly. Many friends of the Student Christian Movement, particularly those of the pre-World War I generations, do not always realize the full import of these changes in redefining the traditional relationship of religion to higher education.

At the turn of the century the Christian Associations had in many of our then highly homogeneous colleges a right to the control and promotion of the voluntary religious activity of all the students on the campus. It was a right sanctioned by custom and by the administration. On many campuses the mere enrollment of a student in the institution automatically made him a member of the YMCA or YWCA. On very few campuses today do the Christian Associations represent the totality of voluntary student religious activity and on a significant number of campuses they are not represented at all. In the first place, our student bodies are no longer as homogeneous as they once were; they are no longer almost exclusively white, Anglo-Saxon, and Protestant, except in sections of the South. Secondly, the Christian Associations have to compete with an ever-increasing group of organizations and interests, each of which is doing a part or almost all of that which was once the program of the Ys. At the same time they find the administration assuming responsibility for certain functions which were by common consent left to the Ys. Much of the work once performed by the Student Y Secretary is now part of the task of the Dean of Men or the Dean of Women. The publishing of the Frosh Handbook, the welcoming and orientation of freshmen, the placing of students in jobs, the organization and direction of certain phases of student social life, and the work with foreign students are among the functions which the Christian Associations have been losing to the administration. This is

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

not to say that the administration is not rendering these services more efficiently, but it does reveal that the Christian Association no longer has the casual entry into organized student life which it once possessed.

In some institutions the administration has gone beyond assuming responsibility for these campus services and through the appointment of Chaplains, Deans of Chapel, Religious Counselors, and Directors of Student Religious Activities is moving to take over the entire direction of student religious work. In some instances the administration was motivated by a desire to bring to the campus full-time trained personnel which could not be supported financially by the limited resources of the voluntary student groups. In other instances the administration felt the need of coordinating efforts that involved excessive competition and duplication. In some few cases the administration was antagonistic to the work of local churches, denominational foundations and Christian Associations and was moved by a desire to separate the entire religious program of the institution from all off-campus affiliation or control. Whatever the motivation of the administration, the Christian Associations have had to redefine their roles in such circumstances.

DENOMINATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

But to suggest that these situations exhaust the new factors to which the Christian Associations have had to make adjustments would be quite inaccurate. During the last quarter century the Church Boards of Education, noting the tendency of the sons and daughters of church members to attend the tax-supported institutions in increasing numbers, have been zealous in establishing denominational foundations to support student pastors in our state and urban universities. Catholics and Jews have tended to follow the Protestant example in this matter.

At Cornell University, University of Pennsylvania, and a few other campuses the Christian Associations and the denominational foundations have united in interesting and fruitful experiments in organizational structure. On many other campuses where such structural unity was not feasible there has been reasonable division of labor and effective cooperation between the

SOME REFLECTIONS ON CAMPUS RELIGION

older Christian Associations and the newer denominational foundations. In some situations, however, there has been a lack of cooperation and, at times, even antagonisms have developed. Usually it is not an unbridgeable chasm for one finds varying degrees of cooperation. Where harmony does not exist the situation is frequently the result of unfortunate conflicts of personality, intensive competition for a very limited supply of capable student leadership, sharp differences in theological belief or educational method, and the simultaneous growth and decline of organizations that exist side by side. It would be impossible to devise a strategy for student religious work which would overcome automatically all of these factors on campuses where they exist.

Despite certain differences in interests, organization, and tradition the national leadership of the YMCA, YWCA and Church Boards of Education have shown some statesmanship in their efforts to effect cooperation and to make adjustments. The fact that they have not been able to do more or to do what they have done more rapidly is the result of the complexities involved in such a large number of widely differing local situations where there are legitimate, but often irreconcilable, interests. All this means that an individual or an organization attempting to do religious work on the campus today must devote an increasing amount of time and skill to working out satisfactory relationships with other individuals and organizations engaged in the same task. In a simpler campus environment one was spared much of this time-consuming effort.

OVER-ORGANIZED STUDENT LIFE

Many observers report that on college campuses today there is in general little interest in any conflict between religion and science and practically no *organized* opposition to religion on intellectual grounds. Yet on campuses where this is the situation and where Christian Associations, denominational foundations, local churches and other religious agencies cooperate satisfactorily the student religious enterprise still encounters formidable obstacles that arise from the nature of organized student life. The foremost of these is the fact that student life is over-organized with

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

a multiplicity of interests and groups whose demands for leadership and support tend to undermine the vitality and effectiveness of the religious program as much as anything else. When one remembers that in addition to participating in these activities students have to attend classes and that an increasing number of them have to engage in financially remunerative work he marvels that the religious groups have been able to survive the fierce competition and to secure any student leadership at all. One is not surprised to learn that on some campuses religious organizations have had to create financially remunerative jobs or "scholarships" to secure the requisite student leadership. Lest he be too hasty and severe in his censure of such practices, one ought to remember that in most cases the administration has set the precedent by subsidizing not only athletics but by offering, in the competitive recruiting of students, so-called scholarships, or more accurately, reductions in tuition, for ability in various pursuits ranging from baton twirling to debating. These practices have furthered individual self-interest to the point where on some campuses when a student is asked to perform some reasonable service for the welfare of the institution he will respond in the affirmative with the suggestion that the time involved be credited toward his NYA quota. There are, of course, students who cannot contribute of their time to religious groups or other worthy enterprises when it involves a substantial sacrifice in their economic livelihood. If all of these factors complicate the problem of securing adequate student leadership for campus religious groups, they also operate to make it difficult to get students to serve on committees, to attend meetings, to take time to engage in systematic study and meditation as well as in the exchange of intimate experience which makes corporate fellowship a reality. The pressure of these factors helps to explain why so much of campus religious activity appears fragmentary and superficial.

PROBLEM OF COMMUNICATION

This, however, is not the entire explanation. On our larger campuses even when students have the time to participate in religious activities it is difficult to bring to their attention specific programs. The matter of communication is a difficult problem.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON CAMPUS RELIGION

Anyone who has attempted to telephone a student on a campus where the ratio of students to telephones is forty to one will understand this. Communication between the leadership of an organization and the general student body is increasingly dependent upon the impersonal mechanisms of the student newspaper, the bulletin board, and the mail. Wherever the use of these mechanisms are, for all practicable purposes, available to only a few interests or wherever they are used so extensively by all organizations that they tend to cancel out each other's effectiveness, student groups are forced to use considerable time and energy in devising ingenious methods for presenting effectively their claims to the student body. In the jargon of the sociologist, the student religious organizations, along with other campus organizations, have tended to change from primary groups based on face to face contact to secondary or special-interest groups which may or may not involve any direct personal relationships. It would not be unfair, therefore, to characterize many of our student religious groups as being primarily small, active, pressure groups seeking, in competition with other groups, to elicit favorable student responses for specific ideas, speakers, meetings and activities. In this process the tendency is to deal with a fractional student rather than with the whole student. This seems to suggest to many that the only practical alternative to the pressure group philosophy of student religious work is to make the religious groups small highly integrated associations around which all the needs and interests of the members are organized. This will remain the only alternative so long as campuses are over-organized and students meet each other as the carriers of special interests instead of as personalities. Administrators and faculties have not done much to simplify the complexity, and to reduce the competition, of extra-curricular activity. They have done more, but not enough, with the problem of caring for the housing, dining, and social needs of students in the effort to reduce social distance. Where such needs are properly met it should be possible to maximize face-to-face relationships, to facilitate the exchange of personal experience, and to reduce the cost and time of impersonal communication, thereby providing a more favorable social environment in which the student religious groups may work.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

SOCIAL STRATIFICATION

The student religious enterprise on many campuses is often limited in its influence by the extent to which it reflects the prevailing social stratification of the student body. This is particularly evident in large state and urban universities where one finds a very vigorous pattern of fraternity life and a student body drawn from a wide range of social and economic backgrounds. It is less obvious on smaller campuses where some economic, cultural or geographical principle of selection occasionally operates to produce a relatively higher degree of homogeneity among the student body. Every campus has, in the words of Professor Willard Waller, "a rating and dating complex." If the students who direct the activities of religious organizations "rate well" on the campus scale of social desirability, the average fraternity member is more likely to participate in them. Conversely, if student religious leaders do not "rate," the problem of securing the support of fraternity members is sometimes so difficult that the student religious enterprise becomes predominantly a non-fraternity enterprise.

On some large university campuses where only the more economically privileged one-third or one-half of the student body can afford fraternity membership, and what goes with it, the religious organizations may decide to direct their programs to meet primarily the needs of the non-fraternity group. They may provide, for example, a building or center for student fellowship, inexpensive recreation, Sunday evening suppers (consisting, perhaps, of potato chips, combination salad, cake and cocoa served by the Ladies Aid for fifteen cents), inspirational talks, guidance programs, as well as the more traditional religious services. In some instances a religious organization will sponsor a cooperative dining hall or dormitory to meet the needs of some of these students. The writer does not belong to the group of those who sometimes refer with contempt to such students as "cocoa Christians" and suggest that such projects be curtailed. It is the business of Christianity and Judaism to meet such student needs, particularly when no one else is attempting to do very much about them. The problem is, however, to meet these and other needs without becoming completely identified with any one class

SOME REFLECTIONS ON CAMPUS RELIGION

of students whether they are at the top or the bottom of the campus ladder. The situation is not always so simple as might be inferred because the ordinary campus is not merely divided into two social strata: the Greeks and the barbarians.

Frequently there are factors of race, color, nationality, and rural vs. urban backgrounds to complicate the stratification. There are of course, campuses on which practically every student belongs to a fraternity and consequently the hierarchial organization of the social strata occurs entirely within the fraternity system. Other interesting variations sometimes occur. On one campus a large percentage of fraternity members attend morning church services with some degree of regularity, but refuse to participate in the activities of the voluntary student societies on Sunday evenings because of the low social prestige attached to them. On another campus the reverse situation exists. All of these situations are reminiscent of the limitations and consequences inherent in the program of "class churches" in American society. The successful transcending of these limitations by student religious groups depends, not only on the particular strategies which they adopt, but on the moral support which the administration and faculty give them in their efforts.

RELIGION AND HIGHER EDUCATION

As some of the disintegrating consequences of modern secularism become more apparent it is not too much to hope that an increasing number of educational and religious leaders will undertake to reexamine the present relationship between religion and higher education. The most basic issue which will be encountered will be whether religion is competent to serve as the basis of unity for all human activities or whether it is simply one interest competing more or less equally with other human interests. It is the latter assumption which dominates both educational theory and practise today. Since this assumption will not be supplanted over-night, it may be wise to suggest that the relation of religion to higher education may be re-examined profitably in at least three specific areas: (1) the curriculum, (2) applied religion on the campus, (3) worship. It is conceivable that more agreement could be reached immediately on specific proposals for

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

modifying the present situation in any of these three areas than could be secured for some new general formulation of the possible relation of religion to higher education.

If one turns his attention to the curriculum, it is instructive to note that while some liberal arts and denominational colleges during the last decade were minimizing the accent on religion by reducing their offerings and graduation requirements in the field of religion a number of state universities were relaxing their traditional opposition to the introduction of religious courses into the curriculum. They were, moreover, evaluating in more liberal fashion the religion courses listed on the transcripts of transfer students. The administration and faculty in each of a number of mid-western state universities have given sympathetic encouragement to the cooperative efforts of denominational foundations to establish Schools of Religion whose offerings are now usually accepted for credit subject to the ordinary restrictions of the university. In these developments teachers colleges, municipal universities and junior colleges have tended to lag somewhat behind the state universities.

There is today quite general agreement that courses in religion have a legitimate place in the curriculum of any college or university. Disagreement, however, does exist as to the nature of the courses to be offered and the extent to which they should be required for specific majors or graduation. Despite the complexities involved in initiating changes in the curriculum, the organization of religious groups on the campus, and worship, there are many indications that proposals for specific changes will receive more than customary attention. If this is true, then the discussions should begin promptly and earnestly.

Difficulties to be Overcome in Realizing the Ideal of Christian Education*

By CHARLES A. ANDERSON

TOTALITARIAN war in Europe is threatening to change the pattern of the Christian college in the United States. In the past two years we have come to realize the degree to which life on our planet has become interwoven through the inter-dependence of nations. This inter-dependence, which is born of our machine age, has extended from our local communities into an international scope. Total defense by the United States has as yet scarcely made any impression on our community life. The growing vastness of our defense effort naturally calls for government control, quite contrary to the usual pattern of peace conditions. The financial and economic structure of the country is being revised and the heavy arm of taxation will reach into every home. Industry and transportation will come under government direction. Military expansion in all branches will change the face of our country. The province of higher education cannot expect to escape from the influence of this wide-spread governmental control. By the extension of the draft, by taxation and by inflation the Christian colleges may find themselves in an educational dust-bowl from which the springs of enrolment and financial support have been diverted.

Ethically the world is floundering. While a group of international gangsters is throttling Europe their policy of selfish grabbing is striking a responsive chord among groups who lack physical and economic abundance. How else can you interpret wide-spread strikes in our national emergency? In numerous places loyalty has given way to self interest. Do present conditions look ominously like the beginnings of a world revolution, the end of which may be unpredictable? Are we about to be

* Analyzing the world situation and the problems of the church-related college, President Anderson of Tusculum College, Greeneville, Tenn., presents some suggestions to be pondered by college presidents.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

faced by organized mobs throughout the world who will discard the principle enunciated by a colonial printer that "honesty is the best policy"? Will they trample ruthlessly over justice and good-will in order to seize their "pound of flesh"?

These external threats constitute a menace to the Church-Related colleges which may well be overwhelming. A few years ago Gerald Johnson in his little book "The Wasted Land" which interprets Howard Odum's voluminous study of "Southern Regions" paid scant heed to the denominational colleges when considering ways and means to rehabilitate the Southeast of our country. He refers almost scornfully to such colleges as centers of mediocrity planted competitively in every state by each denomination. Perhaps total defense may force extensive consolidation upon us both denominationally and inter-denominationally to escape extinction. Undoubtedly we shall face wide-sweeping economic and social changes in the next few years.

INDEFINITE GOALS

When we turn to internal difficulties to be overcome in realizing the ideal of Christian education, we recognize that the problem is basically one of orientation, for the average Christian college has no sharply defined goal. Most institutions' purposes are stated in generalities. In some measure these vague statements are suggestive of Stuart Chase quoting a correspondent who sent to him Hegel's definition of love: "Love is the ideality of the relativity of the reality of an infinitesimal portion of the absolute totality of the Infinite Being." After struggling with this definition, Mr. Chase finally remarked that Hegel was unable to establish communication with his mind. To a considerable extent the colleges lack a clear and commanding purpose to govern their policy, program and leadership.

It is a truism to say that the tenet of religion has largely given way to secular interest among American colleges. In recent years many colleges have become largely utilitarian and to some extent faddist. One of the most significant developments among state-supported institutions of higher education has been their enormous expansion in buildings through the cooperation of the federal *Works Progress Administration* and *Public Works Adminis-*
[96]

THE IDEAL OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

tration. It is therefore natural that prospective students as well as taxpayers feel the marked emphasis on material factors in higher education. Obviously the Christian college cannot compete with such extensive material attractions. In the face of luxurious dormitories, social buildings, and recreational facilities, it is increasingly difficult for the Christian college to convince the general public and prospective students in particular of the value of such an abstract thing as the development of personality. However, would not a more specific statement of purpose reach the attention and interest of thoughtful Americans?

THE AVAILABLE FACULTY

Another difficulty of the Christian colleges lies in the type of faculty available. How grateful we are for the men and women on our faculties who are exerting a positive Christian influence. We have long since come to realize that it is not chapel or courses in Bible or in Christian Ethics that make a college Christian, but rather the underlying Christian philosophy of its teachers. The scientific approach to facts is important, but the Christian frame of reference for the interpretation of those facts in the classroom is of vastly greater importance. Yet how many teachers are lacking at this point? Higher education has become so highly technical that new faculty members must be recruited largely from the universities. In the latter institutions where our younger faculty obtain their training in research and their background of knowledge, the scientific method has been dominant. But all too frequently the young Ph.D. is required to investigate a minor fraction of a larger field of study without gaining an adequate sense of the relationship of that fragment to the whole. Furthermore, the tendency toward inter-departmental jealousies on university campuses is likely to concentrate the thought of the graduate student on petty departmental rivalries rather than on the relation of his field of knowledge to a workable philosophy of life.

Many young teachers come out of the university with splendid by-products of Christianity in the form of noble character and wholesome attitudes. But the scientific viewpoint of the university is at variance with their previously learned statements of Christian belief. Not having met someone at the university who

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

could harmonize these superficially conflicting viewpoints, such graduate students are likely to enter into teaching positions in Christian colleges loyal to the forms of Christian observances, but lacking a vital connection between their presentation of facts and their Christian interpretation of life.

UNDEVELOPED STUDENTS

One of the disturbing difficulties in the Christian colleges is the number of students who pass through the institutions without having achieved a dominating Christian purpose. They learn the facts of the Bible and the principles of Christian Ethics, but to what extent have they learned to adapt those standards in everyday attitudes and activities? This is no more the problem of the colleges than it is of the churches. If we could only inspire our young people to apply Christian principles to daily affairs, how much more effective would be our effort! This is one of the problems to which we must apply our best thought.

So we conclude with the thought that external pressure may cause us to reorganize our forces of Christian education in order that they may continue to make real contribution to national and international living, and among other things to maintain freedom of thought in the midst of an emergency which is increasingly regimenting all of our life. Internally our problem is largely one of orientation, a clear sense of direction on the part of the leaders, a new Christian *Weltanschauung* and a student body fired with Christian purpose.

The Christian College Facing A Chaotic World

By J. LEONARD SHERMAN*

ONE interested in American education and one particularly interested in Christian education is concerned about the place that the Christian college can effectively take in the present chaotic situation of the world. The church college in America was instituted by those who had a very clear conception of the part that such a college should play in the building of American civilization. Until the introduction of state universities, the church college played well that part in American education; it made a contribution that can never be fully measured.

THE CHURCH NEEDS THE COLLEGE

With the increase of state-controlled colleges, the feeling on the part of the churches that their colleges were not so important to the American educational system has gradually increased. Although many colleges still retain their church affiliations, many have drifted away from the immediate influence of their founders. With this drifting there has come a marked indifference on the part of the Church regarding its duty toward American education. From its inception the Christian Church has been a teaching church, and it must remain a teaching church if it is to continue to exert the utmost influence not only upon America but upon the entire world.

The need for that educational impact in America is as great now as when the country was in the colonial stage of development. We live not only in a chaotic world but in a world of fear. Fears beset us on every hand. We fear that democracy may become extinct, that the dark ages may again descend upon the world. These fears have driven us to take action to preserve democracy and modern civilization; and in pursuing this course of action,

* Writing as a greatly interested friend of Christian higher education, Mr. Sherman, a teacher in the Harvard School, North Hollywood, Cal., strikes crucial points in the life of the church-related college.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

we are likely to deceive ourselves in believing that such a course will ultimately lead to permanent peace and to the final removal of the cause of the fears that now harass us. It is the duty of the Church to lead the way in any action that will be effective, for the Church alone is in possession of that which has the power to abolish evils which now threaten to enslave us.

The measures so far adopted are makeshift measures to meet an emergency. Any student of history knows that the same measures have been tried again and again and have been found of no avail. Neither the policy of isolation nor the policy of preparedness will ever settle our international problems or save democracy. Neither has accomplished anything in the past, and it is too much to expect either policy to do anything in the future. The only solution is an attack on the fundamental cause that lies behind these ever-recurring world disturbances; and that attack must be a Christian attack. How is this attack to be made? It must be made by the only existing agency that can make it, the Church; and it must be partially made by the Church through its colleges.

If the Church is to function effectively in a world that has grown alarmingly materialistic, it must use every resource at its command. If it depends solely upon its very circumscribed activities that emanate directly from the Church, it will not be very effective in ushering in a new day. Even its missionary movement alone will never bring the desired results. Much will depend upon its educational work on the collegiate level, but this work will have to be organized with that objective in mind.

THE DEMANDS ON THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

What should the modern Christian college demand? In the first place, it should demand a new type of college president. Too often the college administrator has been chosen from the ranks of the clergy. He has often possessed the ability to secure material aid for his college, but he has too often lacked educational vision and leadership, for he has had no training and little experience in this field. The Christian college demands that its administration be in charge of one who realizes the future possibilities and opportunities of Christian education. Not only must the administra-

FACING A CHAOTIC WORLD

tive officer have educational vision, but he must be an educator in the fullest sense of the word. He must have ability to formulate educational policy and effective educational programs. He must possess the rare ability to pick capable men to serve on his faculty, who will render mutual assistance in carrying out his educational program, for the strength of Christian education rests with the faculty that administers the educational program.

In the second place, the Christian college demands clear-cut objectives. Too often objectives are quite hazy, or outworn, or entirely lacking in the consciousness of the administrator and his faculty. As a result, Christian colleges are not contributing much beyond that of state-controlled institutions.

In the third place, the Christian college demands a Christian-centered curriculum. This demand calls for more than a few courses in the Bible and in the history of Christianity. There should be no narrow denominational emphasis placed upon the religious program of the college. The demand is for the leavening of the entire life of the college with the wholesome philosophy of Christianity. It calls for emphasis upon the great underlying truths of Christianity without compromise and without apology. Only as Christianity permeates the intellectual, the social, and the physical life of its students, can the Christian college justify its contribution to the safeguarding of modern civilization.

In the fourth place, the Christian college needs to draw to its student body potential leaders for other lands. There should not be one Christian college in the United States that does not enroll year after year a number of these young ambassadors. Not only should this opportunity be open to foreign students that are able to finance their own way, but it should be open to any one who has the capacity to be a leader among the people in his community when he returns to his native country. The Church might well carry on a part of its missionary program by diverting a part of its missionary money to scholarships that would make possible this service by the Christian college. Most churches cannot give large sums to the Christian college, but there is not a single church that could not assist with this phase of educational service. What a great service it would be in strengthening the bulwarks against the streams that threaten to engulf the world. This is the

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

place where the Christian Church can effectively supplement its present circumscribed activities and at the same time effectively aid Christian education, which it organized but which it has allowed to suffer from indifference and neglect.

In the fifth place, the Christian college needs the renewed and sympathetic interest of the Christian Church in its program. Although the Church may not be able to give great financial help, it can give invaluable aid through its loyalty and interest in the Christian college and by a manifestation of its belief in the Christian college as a necessary institution in our democracy.

Some educators have expressed the belief that the small college will pass out of existence just as most of the early academies went out with the rapid expansion of the public high school. It will pass if it does not keep alert to the immediate function that such an institution can perform in a democracy blest by a rapid expansion of state-controlled colleges and junior colleges. The Church instituted the Christian college; it can and must preserve the life of the college. This preservation, so necessary to a wholesome and living democracy, can be assured if the Church sees the possibilities of the Christian college and furnishes educational leadership which can make those possibilities realities.

The Standard for Educational Values*

BY G. B. SWEAZY

THE fabric of life is woven in many strands and with many colors. Sometimes very harsh colors dominate the pattern for a time, then gradually fade out and disappear forever. Always strands in softer hues continue through the years. Without them the fabric itself would fall apart. It is of one of these enduring strands that I wish to consider.

President R. M. Hutchins said recently, "Confusion in purpose is today the most striking fact about higher education in America." It is my purpose to illustrate this confusion in purpose by sketching briefly several of the more prominent trends in current educational practice with the hope that this discussion may lead us to a practical and unifying standard for educational values.

SOME TRENDS

First to be considered is a trend toward formalism in education, a trend that is in part a revolt against the inclusion in the curriculum of a multiplicity of new and trivial courses, and against an elective system run wild. It looks upon the student as possessed of a store of latent possibilities that are to be brought out and developed and trained. The emphasis is upon training the student, especially training his mind and intelligence. O. C. Carmichael, of Vanderbilt, expressed this view when he said, "The significant goal of the education process is the development of the ability to think." It follows as a corollary that this trained intelligence is a power which, in Abram Flexner's words, is "capable of being applied in any field whatever." Many of the arguments for the liberal arts college are based upon this theory of education.

A proposal made by President Hutchins, that this training

* This article was delivered as an address at the Educational Association of the Presbyterian Church, U. S., in June, 1940. Dr. Sweazy is dean of Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.—Editor.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

should come through the study of great books, is being put into practice by St. John's College, a small college for men in Annapolis, Maryland. This is the most radical experiment in higher education that is being conducted in the United States today.

St. John's College was established in 1696. Some years ago it lost prestige and enrollment, accumulated a debt of \$350,000, and finally lost accreditation. Apparently it had little to lose by experimenting. President Hutchins became president of its governing board; Stringfellow Barr, a Rhodes scholar and formerly a professor in the University of Chicago, accepted the presidency; and the experiment was started.

The motto of the college is, "Facio Liberos ex Liberis Libris Libraque," "I make free men out of children by means of books and balances." The course of study consists of great books and of laboratory work which repeats and demonstrates classic experiments and discoveries. In the beginning the books numbered about 100. At present the number is about 120, but is changing all the time, mostly at the modern end. To be eligible for a degree, a student must know the books, must be able to read two foreign languages, must have done 300 hours of laboratory work, and must have mastered mathematics through calculus.

This experiment, begun in the fall of 1937 with twenty freshmen, is still too young to show definite results. Yet Milton S. Meyer, in an article in the June, 1939, *Harpers*, says, "So St. John's College, insignificant as it is in buildings, endowment, and prestige, by its very existence threatens every college and university in America."

As the trend that we have been discussing might be labelled with the single word, "training," so the one now to be considered can be designated as "guidance." Dean Holmes, of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, said recently, "The central function of the schools is guidance." (*The Atlantic Monthly*, Jan., 1940.) Attention is centered upon the student as an individual differing in many significant details from every other student. Curriculum and teaching methods are to be fitted to the student's particular needs. "Duty" and "discipline" are words seldom used. In exemplification of this trend we may refer to guidance and testing programs, freshman week, and honor courses.

THE STANDARD FOR EDUCATIONAL VALUES

The Chicago Plan, of the University of Chicago, may be taken as a rather thorough-going illustration of this individualized education. This plan which was not invented by President Hutchins, was put in operation in 1930. Shortly prior to its establishment Professor Ruml, of the University of Chicago, in discussing it said in part, "The student is placed entirely on his own responsibility as far as the development of his intellectual life is concerned. The university virtually says, 'Here is an opportunity. Make of it what you will. We have set certain standards defining what we mean by certain certificates and degrees. If and when you can meet these standards, the university will so certify.'

"The student will be provided with adequate counselling, to be sure; he will have the benefit of advice as to work that would be most profitable to him; but there will be no compulsion, or formal regulations, no credits or cuts which will either push him along or hold him back. He may adopt any method of study that he finds profitable and congenial. He may attend lectures or discussion groups or with his friends may organize discussion and reading groups of his own. He may work in term time and loaf in vacations, or he may work in vacations and loaf during the term. Subject to certain minimum requirements for residence he may spend much time or little on the campus. He may pursue his studies in Chicago, in Paris, or in Berlin. . . .

"The university is aware that students will not profit equally under the freedom from compulsion that characterizes the plan. It is true that some individuals do profit from imposed training, and at certain stages of individual development externally administered intellectual discipline has a beneficial effect. But this type of training the University of Chicago does not feel able to supply. It must be obtained either earlier or elsewhere. It is believed that the advantages of maintaining an atmosphere of freedom, placing clearly upon the individual the responsibility for his own intellectual development, will produce stronger mind and character in the end, even though there may be many wasted hours and an initial period of adjustment."¹

It should be added that the regulations published in the Uni-

¹ *Educational Record*, July, 1931, pp. 362-4.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

versity of Chicago catalog for 1939-40 indicate that it has been found advantageous not to permit the student as wide a range of freedom as was at first intended. Moreover, an impression that I cannot escape as I study such plans as these is that new and sometimes startling ideals, when put into practical application for some years, result in methods that are not nearly as new and different as might have been expected.

Another phase of this attempt to fit educational procedures to the needs of the individual student results from changes in economic and social conditions which have brought into the colleges masses of boys and girls, many of whom formerly would not have completed a high school course. The methods and curriculum approved by experience with a former generation were not suited to the needs, or the abilities, of the multitudes now seeking entrance into institutions of higher learning. Two courses were open; either to restrict admission to those who could profit by the type of education offered, or to make major changes in the educational program.

Perhaps the most significant development arising from this demand for mass education is the establishment of the so-called General College by a number of institutions, such as the University of Minnesota, the University of Louisville, Saint Louis University. In brief summary of the plan I quote from the *Saint Louis Globe Democrat* of last September. "Registration in Saint Louis University's General College, a new unit that has for its objective personal growth rather than command of knowledge, will open tomorrow. . . . The first group of students will be composed of recent high school graduates and college students who are unable to continue their under-graduate work, according to Rev. Wilford M. Mallon, S.J., in charge of the General College. . . . In no sense vocational, the new college discards all the old educational forms of credits, grades and examinations, concentrating on cultural development.

"Conducting the new program, which calls for a radical change in course content and in teaching procedure, will be the cream of the university's faculty. None of the current liberal arts titles, in the fields of Latin, mathematics and science, appear in the curriculum of the new unit.

THE STANDARD FOR EDUCATIONAL VALUES

"Students in the General College will take such courses as *The Art of Study and Thinking, Personality and Mental Health, American Life and Institutions, and Written and Oral Expression*. While some of the courses will have a remedial effect, that phase is strictly a by-product of their chief end, which is to produce culturally educated people."

The third and final trend to be considered is that which lays the emphasis on fitting the student to his environment. It is argued that certain skills and information should be received by the student because of the nature of the environment in which he will live. As the words "training" and "guidance" may be used to characterize the first two trends, so I am tempted to use the word "opportunism" here, but hesitate because of a derogatory implication that is not necessarily deserved.

Mr. A. J. Stoddard, a prominent educator, several years ago prepared an eight-point program for educational progress. Two of his points were:

"Educational policies in this democracy must be consistent with the political philosophy underlying the democracy; and

"Educational planning in twentieth century America must be closely related to social issues and needs." (*Educational Record*, July, 1936, pp. 392, 399.)

President Roosevelt is in hearty and active accord with such an educational philosophy. He has said, "Without . . . the aid of a far-flung educational system in developing the capacities of individuals to produce material comforts and to react intelligently to public problems, the efforts of the Government would be fruitless indeed. All the possibilities of a democracy rest squarely upon education." (As quoted in *Educational Record*, July, 1935, p. 243.)

Stephens College, of Columbia, Missouri, a junior college for women, is one of the outstanding exponents of the theory that the chief end of education is to prepare students to meet the needs of their everyday life. I quote from the 1939-40 catalog:

"The purpose of the program of general education in Stephens College is to give the student—

"First, an intimate contact with those cultural traditions of the race which are most essential for creating the atmosphere that she desires in her own home.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

"Second, a social outlook that will give her an intellectual grasp of the problems of the community and of the larger social problems of her own day.

"Third, a mastery of the basic laws of hygiene that affect her own life and the laws of sanitation and health that affect the physical well-being of her family and of her community.

"Fourth, a sufficient knowledge of vocational opportunity to provide the possibility of self-dependence. . . .

"Should the conservative educator feel that this program under-emphasizes the purely intellectual, let it be remembered first that quite as much intellectual activity can be stimulated through a well-directed program of study in aesthetics or social problems as in courses in mathematics or Greek."

This fragmentary review of recent theories and significant experiments has been given, as was said in the beginning, not primarily because of their interest to us as educators, but rather to illustrate the fact that no single, dominating, unifying goal is recognized in the field of educational endeavor. Nor can this lack of a goal be attributed to any failure to apply to the study of educational problems the scientific method, the method of investigation, the collating of data, the forming of hypotheses, and controlled experiment. "America," as Charles H. Judd has said, "is the contributor of the science of education to the world's list of social sciences."

Let us assume that we begin the education of a student by making a thorough study of his environment so that we know the duties, the responsibilities, the emotional strains, the social contacts for which he should be prepared; then, that we study the student so that we may know how to adapt subject matter and methods to his individual needs; and, finally, that we use this process in such manner as will develop to the utmost his inborn possibilities. Have we attained the ideal in education? Such a method in Germany would produce a loyal and efficient Nazi, and in Italy a Fascist.

H. G. Wells knows what is being accomplished through education, yet it brings him no assurance for the future. In his recent book, "The Fate of Homo Sapiens," he says, "Mankind which began in a cave and behind a windscreen will end in the disease-

THE STANDARD FOR EDUCATIONAL VALUES

soaked ruins of a slum. What else can happen? What other turn can destiny take? . . . There is no reason whatever to believe that the order of nature has any greater bias in favor of man than it had in favor of the ichthyosaur or the pterodactyl. In spite of all my disposition to a brave-looking optimism I perceive that now the universe is bored with him, is turning a hard face to him, and I see him being carried less and less intelligently and more and more rapidly, suffering as every ill-adapted creature must suffer in gross and in detail, along the stream of fate to degradation, suffering and death."

Some years ago Mr. Wells said, "History is a race between education and disaster." Obviously he believes that education has lost the race.

NEEDED: AN ULTIMATE GOAL

We may not agree with Mr. Wells as to the future of mankind, yet as we think of world conditions tonight we must admit that education has not brought peace and happiness to those who have cherished her most dearly. We are reminded of "the ancient fable of the man who stood the dead body upon its feet thrice, only to have it sink to the floor, like an empty sack, and then said, 'It seemeth to lack something.'"

What is lacking? That which gives meaning and direction and life to the whole process, an ultimate goal. If we accept the training theory, what is to be the end of the training? What kind of man should we try to develop? If we place the emphasis upon fitting the student to his environment, which environment is it to be, here or elsewhere, the environment now or ten years ago or ten years in the future? And these are questions that the scientific method cannot answer. It may tell us how to write text books and prepare lectures and conduct classes; it may give us lessons in guidance and may prepare batteries of tests and may outline curricula and give us indispensable aid in countless other ways; but the scientific method cannot tell us what are those highest values which should be sought as the end of the educational process. Science can tell us what *can* be done, and how it can be done most effectively; but science cannot tell us what *should* be done. For an answer to the question *what is of most value* we must go outside the field of education.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

President Hutchins has considered this necessity for a goal, or for a "regulative center of education," to use his phraseology. He says, "Education should be everywhere the same. I do not overlook the possibilities of differences in organizations, in administrations, in local habits and customs. These are details. I suggest that the heart of any course of study designed for the whole people will be, if education is rightly understood, the same at any time, in any place, under any political, social, or economic conditions."²

And for this heart of the course of study, for this regulative center, he appeals to metaphysics. But why stop with metaphysics? Why not face frankly the logical conclusion of the argument? Education cannot determine its own goal. The goal must be the highest and most satisfying that can be conceived, and must be capable of universal application. Where can such a goal be found except in Religion? It is the whole purpose of religion to point out just such a goal, and to show the way, and to provide the power by which it may be attained.

Pope Pius XI in his Encyclical on "Christian Education of Youth" states this truth in these words: "Since education consists essentially in preparing man for what he must be and for what he must do here below, in order to attain the sublime end for which he was created, it is clear that there can be no true education which is not wholly directed to man's last end . . . there can be no ideally perfect education which is not Christian education."³

And it is fitting to add, in this time of aggression by totalitarian governments, that the appeal for Christian education springs not only from our concern for the individual, but from our concern for human society, for the democratic form of government. Thomas Mann in a recent essay on "The Problem of Freedom" says, "It is not by chance that this aggression is aimed not only against Democracy, but, with equal fury, against Christianity itself. For these two concepts are so closely bound together, they are united to such an extent, that democracy may be called the political expression of our Christian feeling for life, of Christian-

² *Educational Record*, July, 1937, p. 434.

³ CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, April, 1939, p. 249.

THE STANDARD FOR EDUCATIONAL VALUES

ity on earth. . . . Freedom, truth, justice, reason, human dignity—what is the source of these ideas which are the support and mainstay of our existence and without which our spiritual life would crumble? Whence do they come if not from Christianity which has made them the law of the world? . . . And we may conclude from the close relationship of Democracy and Christianity, not that they will disappear together, but that they will survive together.”⁴

You will understand, I am sure, that I am not trying to convert you to a belief in the value of Christian education. But it is well for us to remind ourselves at times that we have a high calling, and a calling for which we can give a reason. We need to remind ourselves too that we have not always been as wise as serpents in appropriating and applying approved educational principles. The fact that we know the Truth does not necessarily mean that we know how to teach it. Dewey and Thorndike tell us how to teach minds and bodies, but we are teaching souls. Pedagogically we shall always have much to learn and educational science will have much to teach us.

For illustration, Progressive Education has been proclaiming again the principle that we learn by doing. We were admonished long ago to be doers of the word and not hearers only, yet we are indebted to the Progressivists for the vigorous emphasis they are giving to this old truth. We learn by doing; to the degree that we apply a truth we have made that truth ours; our religious growth keeps step with our religious practice. Are we educators deeply concerned that our pupils put into living practice the truths we teach, or are we content with informing their minds? Christian education is not a matter of the courses taught and examinations passed; it is a matter of honesty in examinations and clean talk and Sabbath observance and reverence in chapel. A Christian college is a practical laboratory of Christian living.

The results of such education will not be confined to our institutions. As President F. L. McCluer, of Westminster College (Mo.), said in his report to the Board of Trustees, “The college will do well to present its claims not only as a liberal arts college free from political control and free to stand for Christian Faith

⁴ *Bul. of Asso. of Amer. Col.*, Dec., 1939, pp. 475, 480.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

as the basis for the cultivation of conscience, but as an institution whose freedom exercises a leavening influence on the whole scheme of higher education in America.

“The state institutions’ relative freedom from political control is safeguarded by the private institutions’ absolute freedom from such control. In a similar way, the Church institution in which Christian Faith is central to the whole program gives religion a secure place in all educational institutions.”

I shall close with a quotation from R. B. Henderson in the January, 1940, *Hibbert Journal*: “Some strange things will begin to happen if God is really brought back to his rightful position in education—and some stranger things will happen if he is not. It is either God in education, or the Devil.”